



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

#8/Remarks
4/28/3
P. H. H.

Re Application of:

Froeberg, P.

Examiner: LOUIS-JACQUES, J.

Serial No.: 09/915,110

Art Unit: 3661

Filing Date: July 24, 2001

For: VEHICLE-BASED
DYNAMIC ADVERTISING

RECEIVED

MAR 04 2003

GROUP 3600

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, DC 20231

REMARKS IN RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

Dear Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated December 23, 2002, please consider the following remarks.

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 are pending.

Double Patenting Rejections

Claims 1-19 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created (nonstatutory) doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1-30 of copending US Application No. 09/912,847. A terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR § 1.321 is being submitted concurrent with the instant response, thereby obviating the double patenting rejection.

TRMB928/JPW/WAZ
Examiner: LOUIS-JACQUES, J.

1

Serial No.: 09/915,110
Group Art Unit: 3661

Claims 1-19 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created (nonstatutory) doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1-26 of copending US Application No. 09/912,645. A terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR § 1.321 is being submitted concurrent with the instant response, thereby obviating the double patenting rejection.

The terminal disclaimers have been amended according to the Examiner's suggestion. The Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the guidance provided.

102 Rejection

Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Cohen (US 6,060,993). The Applicant has reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submits that the present invention as recited in Claims 1-19 is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Cohen.

Independent Claim 1 recites that an embodiment of the present invention is directed to a "vehicle comprising ... a position determination system adapted to determine a position and a direction of travel of said vehicle" wherein content is selected "according to said position and said direction of travel." Claim 4 dependent on Claim 1 recites that the "position determination system comprises ... a digital compass adapted to determine said direction of travel ... and a satellite positioning system adapted to determine said position."

Independent Claim 8 recites that an embodiment of the present invention is directed to a "method comprising the steps of ... determining a position and a

direction of travel of a mobile vehicle using a position and direction determination system" and "selecting content ... according to said position and said direction of travel." Claim 11 dependent on Claim 8 recites that the "position and direction determination system comprises a digital compass adapted to determine said direction of travel using said GPS information and a satellite positioning system adapted to determine said position using said GPS information."

Independent Claim 15 recites that an embodiment of the present invention is directed to a "method comprising the steps of ... selecting an item of said content according to a position and a direction of travel of said mobile vehicle ..., said position and said direction of travel determined using a position and direction determination system." Claim 18 dependent on Claim 15 recites that the "position and direction determination system comprises a digital compass adapted to determine said direction of travel using said GPS information and a satellite positioning system adapted to determine said position using said GPS information."

Cohen only shows a status monitor for monitoring direction of travel. Cohen does not show a position determination system (or a position and direction determination system) for determining direction of travel, as recited in independent Claims 1, 8 and 15. In fact, Cohen does not show or suggest any mechanism for determining direction of travel.

More specifically, Applicant respectfully submits that Cohen does not show or suggest a position determination system (or a position and direction

determination system) comprising a digital compass as recited in Claims 4, 11 and 18. In fact, Cohen does not show or suggest any kind of compass.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Cohen does not show or suggest the present claimed invention as recited in Claims 1-19. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-19 traverse the basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, reconsideration of the rejected Claims is respectfully requested. Based on the arguments presented above, it is respectfully asserted that Claims 1-19 overcome the rejection of record and, therefore, allowance of these Claims is respectfully solicited.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP



William A. Zarbis
Reg. No. 46,120

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113
(408) 938-9060

Date: 2/21/03